

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/903,993	NILSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel M Sullivan	1636	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Ex parte Quayle

- (1) Daniel M Sullivan.
(2) Glenn Ladwig.

(3) _____.
(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 January 2004
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

- Part III.**
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Anne-Marie Falk

ANNE-MARIE FALK, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner requested that a copy of the amendment filed 19 December 2003 be faxed directly to him because the scanned image in the Image File Wrapper was illegible. The Examiner will have the faxed copy entered into the record as a substitute for the original amendment. In a later interview that same day, the Examiner informed Applicant's representative that the substitute specification filed 15 July 2003 is improper because the filing did not include a clean copy.